REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the Office action of November 19, 2009. By way of this response, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 12, 13, and 15-20 have been amended and claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice to their further prosecution. The applicant respectfully submits that all claims are fully supported and that no new matter has been added. The applicant submits that the application is condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-13, 15, and 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention . The applicant respectfully submits that the §112 rejections are rendered moot in light of the foregoing amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nelson et al. (United States Patent No. 6,961,941) in view of Fultheim et al. (United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0039180). The applicant traverses these rejections and respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

<u>Independent Claim 1</u>

Independent claim 1 recites a method including placing a message from a first virtual machine associated with a first virtual machine queue into a second virtual machine queue associated with a second virtual machine, wherein the message is associated with a page of a first address space of the first virtual machine.

Nelson et al. do not teach or suggest such a method. In general, Nelson et al. describe a system configured to transfer data between virtual machines and input/output devices, such as network connection devices. To do so, the system described by Nelson et al. utilizes a kernel, residing at a sub-system level to act as an operating system. Nelson et al. describe the kernel as maintaining a virtual machine monitor (VMM) action queue to hold actions to be taken by a VMM. The Office action cites the VMM action against the virtual machine queues recited in previously presented claim 1. (*The Office action dated November 19, 2009*, page 6).

However, the VMM action queue of Nelson et al. does not receive a message from a virtual machine, wherein the message is associated with a page of an address space of the virtual machine, as recited in claim 1. Rather, the VMM action queue of Nelson et al. receives actions to be taken by the VMM, as determined by the kernel. (*Nelson et al.*, column 15, lines 1-35). That is, the kernel provides actions to the VMM action queue, which the VMM repeatedly checks for its next task. (*Id.*) Unlike the virtual machine queues recited in claim 1, which are associated with and receive data from a virtual machine, the VMM action queue described by Nelson et al. is maintained by the kernel.

To cure deficiencies of Nelson et al., the Office action cites Fultheim et al. (*The Office action dated November 19, 2009*, page 7). In particular, the Office action cites Fultheim as allegedly describing communication among nodes and updating a page table. (*Id.*). However, Fultheim et al. do not teach or suggest placing a message from a first virtual machine associated with a first virtual machine queue into a second virtual machine queue associated with a second virtual machine, wherein the message is associated with a page of a first address space of the first virtual machine, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Nelson et al., Fultheim et al., nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the method of claim 1. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the §103 rejections of claim 1, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 8

Independent claim 8 recites a computer system including first and second virtual machine queues. Further, claim 8 recites that the second virtual machine queue is to receive a message from the first virtual machine, wherein the message is associated with a page of a first address space of the first virtual machine.

Neither Nelson et al., Fultheim et al., nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the computer system of claim 8. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the §103 rejections of claim 8, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 15

Independent claim 15 recites a computer readable memory having instructions stored thereon that, when executed, cause a machine to place a message from a first virtual machine associated with a first virtual machine queue into a second virtual machine queue associated with a second virtual machine, wherein the message is associated with a page of a first address space of the first virtual machine.

Neither Nelson et al., Fultheim et al., nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the computer readable memory of claim 15. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the §103 rejections of claim 15, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of this application and an early favorable action on the merits.

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the applicant will not address such statements at the present time. However, the applicant expressly reserves the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise *(e.g.,* if such statements should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to refund any overpayment and charge any deficiency in the amount paid in connection with this paper or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 50-2455. In addition, if a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) is necessary to maintain the pendency of this case and is not otherwise requested in this case, the applicants request that the Commissioner consider this paper to be a petition for an extension of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) corresponding to the needed extension of time to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
150 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

February 18, 2010

/Daniel J. Glitto/

Daniel J. Glitto
Registration No. 58,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)